REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed March 19, 2007, the Applicant submits this Reply. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-6 remain in this application, of which claims 1 and 4 are independent. No fee is due for claims for this amendment.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-3, of which claim 1 is independent, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. The Office Action asserts that the claims are directed to nonfunctional descriptive material. Such a rejection might be appropriate if claims 1-3 were directed to a medium with nonfunctional descriptive material stored on it. However, these claims are directed to a *process* including a series of actions performed on data stored in memory. Therefore, the assertion that the claims are directed to nonfunctional descriptive material is incorrect. Accordingly, the rejection is traversed.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-6, of which claims 1 and 4 are independent, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action asserts that the language "pixel to be corrected" is a reflection of a process to happen in the future. Even if this characterization of the claim were true, it is unclear how the language is indefinite. Any step in a process that follows another step in that process necessarily "happens in the future" with respect to the prior step. Such sequential activity does not render a claim indefinite. Thus, the claim, which recites steps of "storing an input luminance value . . . of the pixel before color correction," "performing a color correction operation on the pixel," is not indefinite merely because a color correction operation is performed on a pixel after its input luminance value is stored. Accordingly, this rejection of claims 1-6 is respectfully traversed.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, of which claims 1 and 4 are independent, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over U.S. Patent No. 6, 654,028 ("Yamakawa") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,791,567 ("Segal"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted in the Office Action and in Applicant's prior reply, Yamakawa does not teach "determining a scaling factor according to a ratio of the input luminance to the output luminance." See Office Action, page 4, last 2 lines. More precisely, however, Yamakawa does not teach "scaling the output saturation [for a pixel] by the scaling factor" where the scaling factor is determined "according to a ratio of the input luminance [for the pixel] to the output luminance [determined for the pixel]" as claimed in independent claims 1 and 4.

The Office Action relies on Segal for teaching a scaling factor which factors in a ratio of brightness. See Col. 4, lines 7 and 18-19. The brightness ratio is the "ratio of the maximum actual value . . . to the maximum allowable value." This ratio is simply not a "ratio of the input luminance [for the pixel] to the output luminance [determined for the pixel]" as claimed in independent claims 1 and 4.

Because neither Yamakawa nor Segal teaches "scaling the output saturation [for a pixel] by the scaling factor" where the scaling factor is determined "according to a ratio of the input luminance [for the pixel] to the output luminance [determined for the pixel]" as claimed in independent claims 1 and 4. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims is traversed. The remaining claims are dependent claims that are allowable for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this reply, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Appl. No. 10/817,216
Reply Filed: July 19, 2007
Reply to Office Action of: March 19, 2007

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, please charge any fee to **Deposit Account No. 50-0876.**

Respectfully submitted,

Avid Technology, Inc.

By_____
Peter J. Gordon
Registration No. 35,164
Avid Technology, Inc.
One Park West
Tewksbury, MA 01876
Tel.: (978) 640-6789
July 19, 2007